CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1951

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room F-39, the Capitol, Hon. Kenneth McKellar (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators McKellar, Hayden, Ellender, Young, Thye, Ecton, Holland, and Stennis.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF HON. BRENT SPENCE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

COVINGTON FLOOD WALL, KENTUCKY

Chairman MCKELLAR. The subcommittee will come to order.

Congressman Spence of Kentucky, we shall be pleased to hear what you have to say.

Representative SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have come to say a few words in behalf of the continuation of the construction of the flood-protective works at Covington, Ky.

Covington, Ky., is at the confluence of the Ohio and Licking Rivers. The Ohio flows in a westerly direction and the Licking River flows in a northerly direction at that point.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST AND EXPENDITURES TO DATE

The work was authorized by the act of 1938, and the total estimated cost is $8,400,000. $3,500,000 have been expended. The flood wall along the Ohio River has been completed but at the intersection of the Licking River there is a high stretch of ground that furnishes ample protection at that point. Further along the ground is low, there is no protection, and we need a flood wall there.

Because of the completion of the wall on the Ohio River and the starting of construction farther up the Licking River to furnish protection, it has been considered that this is a new project, new construction.

We contend that it is but the completion of the existing project, for without this other construction there would be no protection at all.

PERCENTAGE OF PROJECT COMPLETED

The project is 41 percent completed. The city of Covington has complied with its part in furnishing the land, easements, and relocation of its sewer system and has issued bonds to the extent of $765,000 and is now paying interest on those bonds.

The Ohio River has gone to flood stage 45 times in the last 90 years. It is a treacherous and unpredictable river. In the 1937 flood this city sustained a loss of $2,000,000. I think it would be absolute folly not to complete these protective works as soon as possible.

POLICY OF NO NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS

As I understand it, the reason the appropriation has not been made for this wall on the Licking River is that by a directive of the Budget Bureau to the Army Engineers it is required that no new construction be commenced unless it is in the interest of national defense, but I do not think this comes within the purview of that at all. This is not new construction and it is in the interest of national defense because the city of Covington is a town of 67,000 people and there are a great many defense industries there, and if the waters go to flood, their operations would be discontinued for a long time to come.

The river that Thomas Jefferson once said is the most beautiful river in the world is now an open sewer, and when floods come they deposit disease-breeding filth everywhere and the plight of the people is simply terrible.

There is the sense of insecurity and apprehension to be considered, and in the light of what has happened in the Midwest recently that apprehension has increased.

RESTORATION REQUESTED

I hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee will restore this request for $1,400,000 for the continuation of the construction of these flood protective works.

I feel very confident that if it is put in the Senate bill, the House will accept it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Did you have it up before the House?

Representative SPENCE. I introduced an amendment over there to put it in, but you know there is not any general support for an amendment that affects but one city. They did not adopt the amendment. However, I have had assurances, if I may say so, from some of the Members, that if it is put in, they would not object to it.

I do not think it comes within this directive of the Bureau of the Budget at all. It is not new construction. It is in the interest of national defense and it would be economy to make the appropriation.

I am in favor of effecting all the economies that can be effected, but if a flood comes to that town, it may cause damage in a greater sum than the amount requested. You cannot predict that it will not come.

The Army engineers say there is no protection notwithstanding the fact that 41 percent of this project has been completed. If the Licking River goes to flood, it will flood the city.

If the Ohio River goes to flood, it will back up the Licking River, and it will flood.

The city of Newport, Ky., east of Covington and just across the Licking River, is now protected. It was devastated by floods every 2 years. It is protected by a continuous wall. There is no break in that wall. There is no high ground anywhere to protect the city of Newport. If that condition had existed in the city of Covington, the question here presented would not have arisen.

Senator HAYDEN. Could it not be possible that because the work was finished on the Ohio River front and was not finished on the Licking River front that those two names made them think they were two projects?

Representative SPENCE. I do not know what actuated them, but a mistake was evidently made.

Senator HAYDEN. As I understand the situation there, the protection would start at the high ground, come down the Licking River and down the Ohio and back to the high ground again.

Representative SPENCE. Yes.

Senator HAYDEN. And if any place there is a hole, you have no protection?

Representative SPENCE. That is so, yet they call it new construction.

Senator HAYDEN. They call it new construction because it is on the bank of another river.

Representative SPENCE. Yes, sir; you are right.

Senator HAYDEN. That is all there is to it. It is one project; it could not be anything else.

Representative SPENCE. It is one project and if the condition existed in Covington that had existed in Newport where there was a complete wall surrounding it, this point would not have been made. Because there is a natural protection at a point and they have to construct the flood-protective works beyond that point, they call it a new project.

Chairman MCKELLAR. How much work has been done on the project?

Representative SPENCE. It is 41 percent completed. There has been $3,399,200 expended, which has completed the protective works on the Ohio River; but it is absolutely useless unless the whole project is completed. The city has issued bonds to the extent of $765,000 for the purchase of the lands and easements as required and for the relocation and reconstruction of a new sewerage system. They are paying interest on that money in conformity with the agreement they made with the Federal Government.

I hope you gentlemen will give sympathetic consideration to this. I know how apprehensive my constituents are and the state of unrest and insecurity in which they always find themselves. A flood may come to that city just as it came to the West. The flood of 1937 made a sea of the Ohio River. It may come again. If it does the injury to this city will be greater than the cost of this construction.

Chairman MCKELLAR. If there are no more questions, we are very much obliged to you, Congressman.

Representative SPENCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, A DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FROM THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

KAWAINUI SWAMP FLOOD CHANNEL, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Chairman McKellar. The next witness is Delegate Farrington, of Hawaii.

Delegate Farrington. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Joseph R. Farrington. I am the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I strongly urge that funds be appropriated to enable the United States engineers to undertake the construction necessary to provide flood control in the Kailua area of the island of Oahu in the Territory of Hawaii.

CONSTRUCTION PLANNED

The project involves the construction of a tidewater flood channel 9,525 feet long and 105 feet wide at the bottom and an average of 13 feet deep in the main portion from the Kawainui swamp to the ocean just north of the Kailua area. The project involves a total expenditure of $848,094 by the Federal Government and $231,480 by local interests.

The expenditure of this fund was authorized in the Rivers and Harbors and Food Control Act (Public Law 516) of the Eighty-first Congress. The original survey was undertaken under authority of the Food Control Act approved August 11, 1939.

No further work of any kind was done on the project during the period of World War II. The demand for construction of other projects was so much more pressing that this had to be postponed. The survey that resulted in the present recommendation was undertaken under the authority of section 1 of Public Law 534 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The report of the engineers is contained in Document 214 of the Eighty-first Congress.

Since Congress authorized this project, two developments of very great importance have taken place that add to its urgency.

The first was another flood that occurred in March of this year. It was attended with extensive damage to residences in this area.

The rapid growth of the area. as a result in large part of the development of the naval air station at Kaneohe, brought much more serious consequences in the wake of this flood than in previous floods.

POPULATION

The population of the Kailua area has increased 300 percent since the first survey was undertaken. It is now estimated to have a population of close to 10,000. A large part of these people live on the sand bar between the swamp and the ocean and are liable to be flooded in the event of heavy storms.

The second development and the one upon which I ask the appropriation of funds at this time, is the decision to establish a permanent overseas base for a marine regimental combat team at the naval air station at Kaneohe. This is authorized in a bill that has already passed the House and is now pending in the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I believe. Work on the improvement of this station

has already begun, that is, the enlargement of the airfield, and additional funds are being asked in the military public works bill now being reported by the House Committee on Armed Services.

The marine base is situated on Mokapu Peninsula that is adjacent to the Kailua area and near the swamp. It is reached by passing through this area.

DEFENSE NEED

The relationship of this area to the naval air station is a very important one because Kailua is the natural residential area for civilians who will be employed at the marine base, the wives of officers and enlisted men and the like, and because any flood is likely to hamper transportation facilities to and from the base. This is evident from looking at the map.

The importance of this development is recognized by the Department of Defense. Admiral Arthur W. Radford, commander in chief of the United States Pacific Fleet, supports the appropriation of funds for this purpose. His position is on record with the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. I believe this is available to the committee.

I presented this request to the House committee and in an informal letter, addressed to me at that time, the committee took the position that it is unwilling to act prior to the time the item had been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

I understand that since then Admiral Radford has made his representation to the Department of Defense, and they have gone to the Bureau of the Budget, and I believe it should be available to the committee.

LOCATION OF PROJECT

Senator HAYDEN. Might I ask how far this project is north of Honolulu?

Delegate FARRINGTON. About 15 miles. It is on the other side of the island, as we say in Hawaii; it is north of the Koolauloa Range.

Senator HAYDEN. Does this drain the swamp?

Delegate FARRINGTON. It does not drain it. It only provides flood control. As a matter of fact, we are not seeking to completely drain the swamp because some of the waters of the swamp are used for irrigation purposes in the Waialua area, but it provides control in the event of these heavy rains.

FLOOD LOSSES

Between 1895 and 1947, there were 15 floods. Three of them were regarded as major floods, 10 were regarded as medium, and 2 were regarded as minor. Since then there has been one serious flood.

The losses by the 1921 flood were only $185,300 but that was because the area was almost undeveloped.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You say there are barracks out there?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Within a few miles there is a rapidly developing community that is between this swamp and the ocean and this is the area that is flooded when this swamp overflows.

Adjacent to that, on this peninsula, is the Kailua Naval Air Station that they plan now to develop as a base for a permanent overseas regimental combat team, in fact, the only permanent overseas base for a marine regimental combat team.

Senator ELLENDER. Is the beach resort near that?

Delegate FARRINGTON. This is the beach area.

Senator ELLENDER. What would the work consist of?

Delegate FARRINGTON. It would consist of the construction of a channel or canal about 9,000 feet long from the southern part of the swamp to the sea that would take care of floodwaters in the event of a storm.

Senator ELLENDER. It would act more or wess as a drainage canal?

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is right, but it is not to be constructed so as to completely drain the swamp.

The drainage of the swamp, we feel, is our responsibility.

Senator ELLENDER. It would carry off the water a little faster than the facilities that are now there will do.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Have the Corps of Engineers reported favorably on this?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I believe they have a favorable report. There was originally a favorable report but whether there is a recent report, I am unable to say.

General CHORPENING. It is an authorized project, Senator. There were no funds included in the budget estimate this year for this project.

PLANNING FUNDS

Senator ELLENDER. Have the plans been made?

General CHORPENING. No, sir. No plans have been made.

Senator ELLENDER. The only thing we could obtain is planning money.

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir, we could use planning funds for this project.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Have you made a recommendation to the budget on it?

General CHORPENING. We have not.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Senator HOLLAND. What was the damage in the last flood, Mr. Farrington?

Delegate FARRINGTON. Several hundred thousand dollars. I do not know exactly what it was. In 1947, the improvements and the land were assessed a value of $20,000,000 and in 10 years they expect to reach $28,000,000. If a flood takes place within the next 5 years, they estimate the loss will be over $700,000.

Senator HOLLAND. What was the report of the engineers as to the damage sustained in the recent flood?

Delegate FARRINGTON. I do not know, Senator Holland. I do not know whether they have a report on that particular flood.

Senator HOLLAND. General, do you have the data on the amount of damage sustained there as shown by the engineers?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir. There was a flood there on the 27th of March of this year. Approximately 400 acres of the town of

Kailua were flooded and 250 families evacuated. Our preliminary estimate of the damage was $200,000. That was in March of this year.

Senator HOLLAND. What about the last major flood?

Chairman MCKELLAR. It has been some time since I have been to Hawaii, but I had an idea that was a bathing beach out there.

Delegate FARRINGTON. All that side of the island has very fine beaches. This peninsula that they took for the naval air station and now are using for the Marines is one of the finest resort areas that I have ever seen. It is a beautiful spot with glorious beaches, a perfect place to train in.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, sir.

Are there any further questions, gentlemen?

Senator HOLLAND. I asked a question of General Chorpening. I think he is ready with the answer.

General CHORPENING. The most severe flood was the 1921 flood, and we estimated that if that flood occurred now, it would cause damages amounting to $763,000. That is in our report on which the authorization was made. That is the largest flood which has occurred, Mr. Chairman. The most recent damaging flood was in March of this year.

Senator ELLENDER. What is the estimated cost of the project?

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST

General CHORPENING. The estimated cost of the project is $890,400 based on 1950 prices.

Delegate FARRINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say, finally, the legislature of the Territory, in the last session provided funds to carry out the Territory's share of this project, and we would like to get a start on it.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Farrington a question?

I know you are not responsible for this, and do not think I am intimating that, but when those people and the authorities responsible for the building up of this beach area knew there had been a flood like that back in 1921, why is it that they went ahead and spent millions of dollars in developing an area like that without first providing protection which they know they are going to have to have in case of another flood of another disaster? Why is it?

Delegate FARRINGTON. It is the old story of locking the barn door after the horse is gone.

Chairman MCKELLAR. It must be an inviting place, from what I saw of it.

Delegate FARRINGTON. It is a very inviting place.

PURPOSE OF PROJECT

Senator ELLENDER. As I understand it, this improvement is not so much to protect the beach as it is to protect the land between the range and that ridge near the sea where the beach is.

Delegate FARRINGTON. It is back of the beach area because the waterfront is not flooded; that is at a higher elevation.

Senator ELLENDER. This project, as I understand it, is merely to more or less drain that swamp.

Delegate FARRINGTON. That is right. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES C. DAVIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

BUFORD DAM, GA.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Our next witness is Congressman Davis, of the State of Georgia.

Representative DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to show you some newspaper photographs which will show the conditions on the Chattahoochee River, to which I will address myself. These photographs show land inundated there by this river in time of flood, and some of the territory which you look at there now is within the city limits of the city of Atlanta.

We have been allotted this morning approximately 15 minutes within which to present our facts, and in order that the time of the committee may be conserved, I have prepared here my statement, which I will submit, with the committee's consent, to the reporter for inclusion in the record.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Without objection, your statement may be placed in the record.

You may give us the high lights.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. DAVIS, OF GEORGIA

Mr Chairman and gentleman, Congressman John S. Wood, of the Ninth District of Georgia, had planned to appear with us before your subcommittee in behalf of the Buford Dam. His physician has ordered him to take a rest, however, and for that reason he is unable to be here today. He has written me a letter requesting me to present to the subcommittee his personal interest in this project, and to state for him his sincere hope that the subcommittee may approve the requested appropriation for this item. With the subcommittee's permission, I will attach Congressman Wood's letter herewith as a part of my statement.

I also would like the permission of the subcommittee to attach as part of my statement a special presentment of the Fulton County grand jury regarding the Buford Dam, which special presentment was just a few days ago adopted by the grand jury, and forwarded to me by Hon. Paul Webb, solicitor general of the Atlanta circuit.

We have a large number of citizens from Fulton County, DeKalb County, Gwinnett County, and Forsyth County, in the State of Georgia, appearing here to urge the impelling need for continuation of work upon the Buford Dam. All of them would be glad to speak in behalf of the project and to state in detail the reasons why this work should proceed as rapidly as possible to a conclusion.

However, your committee staff notified me the early part of this week that it is the intention of the subcommittee to conclude its hearings Monday of next week, and that therefore there would be time for only two witnesses to speak in behalf of the project. This large number of witnesses, therefore, will not be able to speak, but their presence here coming this distance of some 650 miles to appear before your subcommittee indicates the deep and intense interest which the citizens of these counties feel in this important project.

I would like to call to the subcommittee's attention also the fact that Representative Sidney Camp, of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, likewise is intensely interested in the completion of this dam, but is prevented from being here this morning by urgent reasons necessitating his presence elsewhere.

The Buford Dam is a part of the project known as the Appalachicola, Flint, and Chattahoochee River project, in Florida and Georgia.

The project consists of four dams, the southernmost of which is the Jim Woodruff Dam located at Chattahoochee, Fla., at the State line between Georgia and Florida. The Jim Woodruff Dam is under construction now and is well along toward completion. That dam is a multiple-purpose dam, having for its purposes navigation and power. The plan for the Jim Woodruff Dam is to maintain a 9-foot navigation channel up to Columbus, Ga., a distance of about 120 miles from that point to the mouth of the river at the Gulf of Mexico.

The Buford Dam is the northernmost dam on the project and is located about 35 miles northeast of Atlanta, Ga., on the Chattahoochee River. It also is a multiple-purpose dam and is the only flood-control dam in the project. It has for its purpose flood control, power generation, pollution abatement, recreational facilities, and, in addition to these functions, it is absolutely essential—and Army engineers have testified on numerous occasions to that effect—to store in its reservoir the water necessary to assure positive navigation below Columbus. In the dry seasons of the year the natural flow of the river will not afford sufficient water to maintain the 9-foot navigation channel between Columbus and the Gulf of Mexico. It therefore is necessary to have this water stored in the rainfall area of the State by the Buford Dam, so that the necessary water may be discharged to maintain the 9-foot navigation channel on the lower part of the river.

The Army engineers have from time to time testified that the Buford Dam is the key dam of the entire project. At one of the earlier hearings on this project, Colonel Feringa (later General Feringa) testified as follows:

"Senator RUSSELL. Of course, the Buford Dam is the key dam on water storage in this area?

"Colonel FARINGA. That is right. The Buford Dam is an important part of the plan, because without the Buford Dam, we will not be able to assure positive navigation below Columbus, and as it will also be a power dam, certain water will be discharged as a result of generating the power. Hence the low-water flow of the river will be augmented."

Senator Russell asked this further question:

"Senator RUSSELL. So far as the Chattahoochee is concerned, for anything that is north or west of the junction dam, for flood control or navigation, the Bufort site is the key site?

"Colonel FERINGA. The Buford Dam is the only one for flood control."

Definite testimony has also been adduced upon these hearings that there are 3 months in the year on the average for the past 30 years when the river is so low that small tugboats cannot be operated up and down the river, and that there are on an average of 3 months in the year that the low swamps on the lower reaches of the river are so overflowed that lumbermen cannot log at all, making only 50 percent of the time that the lumber people are able to log to any advantage. They have stated in these hearings that lumber camps and sawmills are actually closed down at times on account of the high water or low water during certain periods of the year. That means, of course, that many men are out of work on account of lack of flood control on the river, and means also that the economy of the country is denied the products of these sawmills and lumber camps, which the Nation needs so desperately at this particular time.

I attach also herewith as a part of my statement photographs of actual flood scenes on the Chattahoochee River showing the devastating effects of the tremendous overflow of the Chattahoochee River, and hundreds of square acres of land submerged under many feet of water, which land is now in the city limits of the city of Atlanta.

The Buford Dam, when completed, will control all this flooding, and there will be no more land submerged under floodwaters such as these pictures show.

From the standpoint of the defense program the Federal Government has a direct interest in the early completion of the Buford Dam. The quicker this dam is completed the quicker year-round navigation up the river from the Gulf of Mexico to Columbus, Ga., can go into operation. Fort Benning, one of the largest military installations in the country, is located adjacent to the Chattahoochee River and will be served by this river navigation. This navigation is directly dependent upon the water to be stored in the reservoir created by the Buford Dam for year-round operation.

Furthermore in the Atlanta area we have Fort McPherson, we have the Bell bomber plant, we have the Conley Quartermaster Depot, we have a naval air station, we have great industrial potential, all of which are dependent upon a steady dependable water supply. The Buford Dam will add greatly to the pro-

tection of this water supply, upon which all these facilities depend for continued operation.

This is not a pork-barrel project. It is a self-liquidating project. In addition to that this district sorely needs the additional electric power which will be created through the construction of this dam. The time is here when it should be rapidly pushed to completion. There is no economy involved in doling out little driblets of money merely to keep the project alive. It is common sense to push it to completion. I am sure that the testimony which has been given by the Army engineers confirms what I am saying here this morning, and I earnestly urge this committee to give us an appropriation which will enable this work to move on rapidly toward completion of the project.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1951.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: As you of course know, Dr. Calver has directed me to get away from Washington for a short rest, and I, therefore, plan to be down in Georgia for approximately 2 weeks.

I regret very much that my absence from Washington will render it impossible for me to accompany you and others who are interested in the Buford Dam project when you appear before the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Senate Appropriations Committee on Saturday morning, July 28, at 10:30 a. m.

You, of course, know how intensely interested I am in securing an appropriation which will be adequate to insure the continuance of work on this project without delay or interruption. I have spoken to members of this Senate subcommittee personally about my interest, but I would be most grateful to you if you would, at the time you appear before the committee, again assure them of my very real interest in this matter and express my sincere hope that they may approve the requested appropriation for this particular project.

Best wishes.

Your friend.

JNO. S. WOOD,
Member of Congress.

Hon. GEORGE P. WHITMAN,
Judge, Fulton Superior Court, Atlanta, Ga.:

We, the grand jury for July-August 1951 term of Fulton superior court, hand you herewith the following special presentment:

There is now pending before the National Congress the question of whether or not funds will be appropriated for the development of the Chattahoochee River, and particularly what is known as the Buford Dam, some 35 miles above Atlanta.

One of the great natural resources of the Southeast is an abundant supply of water, and the conservation and regulation of our water resources is of the highest importance to the future of our State.

Particularly is this true of metropolitan Atlanta. The control and regulation of the Chattahoochee River not only guarantees a constant water supply for Atlanta, but it obviates the danger of future flood damage. The building of the Buford Dam, we are informed, will add very greatly to the supply of badly needed electric power, and control and regulate the flow of the Chattahoochee River so as to make it available for water-using industries, including its use for cooling purposes by great power plants now situated on its banks and others which may be located there later.

The experience of other parts of the Nation where water supplies have run short at certain periods of the year and of other places where uncontrolled floodwaters have done millions in damage and cost many lives, should surely teach us all the great value of and necessity for the control and regulation of our great river systems throughout the Nation.

This grand jury is informed that the cost of the Buford Dam will be repaid to the Government through the sale of electric power at the dam to the local power companies, in addition to its many other advantages in forming great lakes in north Georgia for recreational purposes and in aiding and promoting navigation on the Chattahoochee River from Columbus on to the Gulf.

This grand jury is aware of the fact that sometimes these river and water-power projects are referred to as pork-barrel appropriations, but certainly the development of the Nation's water resources, bringing back to the people many times their cost in the varied benefits therefrom, should not be considered as a waste of public funds. Indeed, the conservation and control of such natural resources are the normal functions of the Federal Government.

The grand jury is further informed that some $2,300,000 has already been appropriated by the Government for certain exploratory and preliminary work at the Buford Dam site and that any failure to carry this work on would result in the abandonment of plans drawn for special-type machinery, the erosion of certain excavations, and cause the loss of the investment already made there, in addition to the unwisdom of failing to provide for the completion of what has been termed by the Army engineers as one of the most important dams on the entire Chattahoochee River system.

Accordingly, this grand jury commends the activities of the local governments in the metropolitan area and of the various north Georgia counties interested in the Buford Dam, and calls upon all of our citizens to realize the importance of the development of the Chattahoochee River.

We call upon our Representatives in the National Congress to lend their best efforts toward obtaining the necessary funds for completion of the vitally important Buford Dam.

We ask that these presentments be filed and made a part of the records of this court and that a copy of the same be sent to all Members of Congress from Georgia and the mayor and General Council of the City of Atlanta and that the daily press be furnished a copy.

This the ——— day of July 1951.

FRANK K. SHAW, *Foreman.*
CLARENCE L. WOOD, *Secretary.*

ORDER

The within and foregoing grand jury special presentment for the July–August 1951 term are ordered filed as recommended by the grand jury.

This the ——— day of July 1951.

GEORGE P. WHITMAN,
Judge, Superior Court, A. J. C.

WITNESSES INTERESTED IN PROJECT

Representative DAVIS. Gentlemen, I would like to state that we have here people who have come approximately 650 miles in behalf of this project, only three of whom will address the committee, but I would like to call the names of the others.

We have Mayor William B. Hartsfield, of Atlanta; Alderman Lee Evans, of Atlanta; Councilman James Jackson, of Atlanta; Councilman James Vickers, of Atlanta; Councilman Ralph Huie, of Atlanta; Paul Weir, general manager, Atlanta Water Works; Frank Shaw, of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce; Robert M. Holder, of the De Kalb County Chamber of Commerce; H. Jack Turner, city manager of Buford; Weldon Gardner, of Buford, who is president of the Upper Chattahoochee Development Association; Weldon Archer, chairman of the County Commissioners of Gwinnett County; Ray Merritt, president of the Buford Kiwanis Club; Milton McLain, vice president of the Upper Chattahoochee Development Association of Gwinnett County; L. D. Ewing, secretary of the Upper Chattahoochee Development Association; and Julius McCurdy, De Kalb County attorney and who also represents the chamber of commerce.

Having stated my facts in my statement, I will not take up the committee's time, but I would present to the committee now, Mayor Hartsfield, of Atlanta.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, Mayor Hartsfield, come forward.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM B. HARTSFIELD, MAYOR OF ATLANTA, GA.

BUFORD DAM, GA.

Mr. HARTSFIELD. Gentlemen, I would like to submit to you a small map of our city limits which shows some 9 miles of the Chattahoochee now in our city limits.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is this the project in which Senator Russell is interested?

Mr. HARTSFIELD. Yes, sir; the Senator is very much interested in this project.

1952 BUDGET ESTIMATE

The President's budget included $900,000 for this project and we appeared before the House committee and cheerfully asked for a little more. To our surprise the $900,000 was taken out of the budget.

We regard the Buford Dam, gentlemen, as being a project under construction.

Chairman MCKELLAR. How much has been expended on it?

TOTAL EXPENDITURES TO DATE

Mr. HARTSFIELD. Over the last 3 or 4 years, and I think General Chorpening will confirm this, $2,300,000 has been spent in actual construction work. The saddleback dike has been constructed. I think they are at work now on the tailrace and tunnel.

We read the engineers' testimony before the House committee and Colonel Potter testified that to close it down would require the scrapping of plants for the turbines and generators and the question was asked, "Could there be salvage for some other construction?" The answer was that this is an earth-work type dam of special construction and those plants now in progress would be utterly valueless if scrapped.

In addition, erosion would set in on the work that has already been done and somebody would have to appropriate maintenance funds there or lose the greater part of the work that has been done.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Mayor Hartsfield, the testimony on other projects of this kind, and on this one, too, is that about one-third of what has already been spent on the projects will be lost if they are not continued.

Mr. HARTSFIELD. Yes.

MULTIPURPOSE PROJECT

As you gentlemen know, Buford is a multipurpose dam. It promotes navigation on the river below Columbus. It supplements and firms up the power on the dams below Columbus. We are a power-short section of the country. We need that power desperately. We need it for the war plants. We need it for industrial expansion.

In addition, gentlemen, the thing that worries us about that river, and if you will look at that photograph that we gave you, you will see it, the principal power plant in the Atlanta metropolitan district, the Georgia Power plant, is almost about to go out with that water

around. Now, at some periods of the year we suffer drought there. That plant takes out of that river five times more water than Atlanta does for waterworks purposes. Of course, they put it back further down the river. But if that river is not regulated, we stand the chance of having our power flooded out one year or cut by drought the next year.

In 1925 we had a drought there that would have put that plant out of operation.

In addition to that power plant you see in the picture there in the Atlanta Constitution in 1948, the Georgia Power Co. is building another plant 30 miles down the river which likewise will depend on this river for cooling water.

So, gentlemen, we are greatly concerned. It is a multipurpose dam; it serves a good purpose.

If the Buford Dam, which has been designated by the engineers as a key dam on the Chattahoochee River, is not an important dam, we cannot see where any of them are very important.

POWER PRODUCTION

Chairman McKellar. About how much power will it provide?

Colonel Milne. 86,000 kilowatts.

ORIGIN OF TERM "PORK BARREL"

Mr. Hartsfield. To our horror, we saw the term "pork barrel" in the paper when it came before the House. I want to say that I had our local library look up that term "pork barrel." It amazed me that that word should be used for nothing but these waterway power developments, nothing else. They ran a research on it, through the dictionaries and through English literature, and gave me a full report on the word.

Chairman McKellar. You might give that to us.

Mr. Hartsfield. If you will bear with me, Senator, I will give it to you by memory.

It started, of course, in New England, with the institution of the pork barrel in the old New England store where the community came and helped themselves. Of course, they paid for the side of pork. It was very important to the community for that barrel to be full of pork or they would run out of something to eat.

Then about that time came the development of a few post offices and canals. The railroads of that day and the electric companies did not like the promotion of competition of canals and public power. So the term "pork" was used; then it got to "pork barrel," and my report gives the names and dates of the papers that used it editorially. It seems that a good record is kept by these people who delight in tracing terms in the English language.

Invariably the term was used in New England and in the New York press, papers that were opposed to the development of these things, particularly in other parts of the country. So every time they had a development of a waterway or promotion of public power, these New England and New York papers would denounce it and refer to it as "pork barrel." The use of the term began in the 1800's and came on down, used by consent for nothing but those projects that seemed to be in competition to the railroads and the power companies. I

think they were very successful in fastening the name "pork barrel" onto the development of the country's resources. We do not think that the development of our natural resources should be referred to as "pork barrel."

Chairman McKellar. The greatest development, in my judgment, has been the development of power all over the country.

The situation today is that nearly every State in the Union has a shortage of power; they need more than they have.

The Government has undertaken to build or help build these dams and plants which produce more power. It has been of the greatest benefit to our country.

The term "pork barrel" is not only attached to that whole transaction, but it is attached to this committee. They call us the "Pork Barrel Committee."

Mr. Hartsfield. Senator, the greatest and best work that can be done in the South is in the development of its rivers and waterways. You will take off future doles.

Senator Stennis. That is true all over the Nation, is it not?

Mr. Hartsfield. Yes, sir. These are the natural assets of this country. It is the function of the Federal Government. If anybody presses me, we can show a lot of things that we can say would be more nearly "pork barrel" than the development of our own resources.

Senator Hayden. You indicated that you had this information in writing. Would it be possible to have it sent up here and included in this record?

Mr. Hartsfield. When I go home I will do it. I sent Senator McClellan a copy of it, and he wrote me and thanked me and said he was going to use it.

Chairman McKellar. I wish you would send a copy for the record.

Mr. Hartsfield. Yes, sir. It was a term invented by the enemies of public power and public waterways, and used by the papers of the East to deride these propects. They started it back in the 1800's when the power companies were strongest.

(The information had not been supplied at the time the hearings were concluded.)

Chairman McKellar. The principal user of this term, so far as this committee is concerned, is Mr. Smith, who represents a power interest himself here in Washington; 2, 3, or 4 years ago he was getting a salary of $65,000 a year. He did not call that pork barrel.

We are very much obliged to you, Mayor Hartsfield.

Does anyone want to ask further questions?

OCCURRENCE OF FLOODS IN FALL AND WINTER

Senator Stennis. Mr. Chairman, I have just one observation.

This flood that you picture here occurred in November?

Mr. Hartsfield. Yes, sir.

Senator Stennis. Do the floods ordinarily come during that season of the year?

Mr. Hartsfield. Mostly in the fall and sometimes in the spring. Now, in 1925, Senator, we had a great drought in the Southeast. The river went down so low that everybody in the section was worried about the supply of drinking water, much less power water.

Senator ELLENDER. I notice that this is one of four structures to be erected in that locality. Is one dependent on the other? You have here the Jim Woodruff, Upper Columbia, Fort Benning, and Buford. Can one be constructed without having the other constructed simultaneously?

Mr. HARTSFIELD. Of course, Senator, and we are great advocates of the development and finishing of the Jim Woodruff Dam on this river. We, of course, speak in behalf of the entire river. The Jim Woodruff Dam is well along. This is the second one that is to be started.

Senator ELLENDER. On the same river?

Mr. HARTSFIELD. Yes, sir. But the Buford Dam, gentlemen, protects the water in the rainfall area where it accumulates. As you know, these Tennessee, South Carolina, and North Georgia mountains are one of the greatest rainfall areas in the Nation, and this Chattahoochee River runs up into that section. Buford will protect that rainfall there and let the water down and promote the development of the whole river. It will not only regulate it and enable us to use the river for manufacturing and for power companies but it will firm up the power on any and all dams below Buford.

I think that Colonel Feringa probably named it in the hearings before this committee several years ago when he referred to Buford as the key dam of the Chattahoochee River. It forms, as you know, the boundary between Alabama and Georgia. We think it is a project of great importance to us.

We have there, gentlemen, a great plant that is going to build your bombers that are going to do the job if we ever have to do it out there. That is what was formerly known as the Bell Bomber plant, B–29's. We serve them with water. We served your great Conley warehouse there that we are told supplied 25 percent of the African invasion in the last war. We have quite a number of very important plants there. As you gentlemen know, we need very badly the power there. It will be part of the power pool that will supply your H-bomber plant down on the Savannah River.

HOUSE ACTION

Frankly, we were amazed when it was left out of the House committee report, especially in view of the fact that it is in progress, and the investment that is already there will be destroyed.

We hope that you will restore it and we would like a little more.

Senator ELLENDER. Did you appear before the House?

Mr. HARTSFIELD. Yes, sir; in a purely informal way. We thought it was a project under construction and we were sliding along. Maybe we relaxed our interest. The term "pork barrel," I believe, was abroad in the land at that time.

Senator ECTON. This item was cut out on the floor of the House rather than in committee, was it not?

Mr. HARTSFIELD. I think it was cut out in the committee.

Chairman MCKELLAR. It was cut out in the committee.

Mr. HARTSFIELD. Thank you, gentlemen.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We are very much obliged to you.

85787—51——84

NAVIGATION CHANNEL, CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER

Representative DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the answer Mayor Hartsfield gave to Senator Ellender's question, this 9-foot navigation channel which runs from the Gulf of Mexico up to the dam at Columbus, Ga., also needs the Buford Dam there to release the water to maintain this 9-foot navigation channel during the dry season. Otherwise, the engineers testified, it would not be fully effective.

Senator ELLENDER. So, there is a relationship between the two dams?

Representative DAVIS. Yes; there is.

Gentlemen, Congressman John Wood, who represents the Ninth District of Georgia; Congressman Sidney Camp, who represents the Fourth District; Congressman Cox of the Second District; and Congressman Forrester, of the Third District of Georgia, all have authorized me to express to this committee their interest in this project. Because of the change in the time of the hearing, they could not be here this morning, but they authorized me to make that statement for them.

To supplement the statement of Mayor Hartsfield, I would like to present to you for a short statement, Mr. Weldon Gardner, of Buford, who is president of the Upper Chattahoochee Development Association.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, Mr. Gardner.

STATEMENT OF WELDON GARDNER, PRESIDENT, UPPER CHATTAHOOCHEE DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

BUFORD DAM, GA.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you are familiar with the technical information on this project. It has been enumerated from time to time.

I would like to mention one thing, I think, it is very important in this project: That is the regulation of the flow of water.

The mayor just mentioned about the times when we have floods and the times when we have droughts. I think the regulation of this stream is considerably important.

Recently we have been face to face with the possibilities of floods. Naturally, when a disaster strikes, why, we bring it closer to home and see what it would do to us. I think there is a possibility of a flood on any river at any time. I would rather see the money spent in completing this project rather than to relieve suffering after a flood strikes.

We would like very much to insist that the committee see fit to put back into the bill at least the amount that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

This work is now under construction. One saddle dike is completed; the emergency spillway is completed. They are now at work excavating the forebay tunnels and the tailrace, and in the process of moving this dirt from forebay to spillway they are in turn building the other two saddle dikes, which is an economical feature of picking up the dirt in one place and carrying it on.

Since this group is at work, we would feel terribly bad if this work was not carried on. We would like to urge your favorable consideration.

Chairman MCKELLER. All rights, we are very much obliged to you.

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF JULIUS McCURDY, COUNTY ATTORNEY, DeKALB COUNTY, GA.

BUFORD DAM, CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER, GA.

Representative DAVIS. Our last witness is Mr. Julius McCurdy, who is the county attorney for DeKalb County, Ga.

Mr. MCCURDY. I come from Judge Davis' home county, one of the most populous counties in the Chattahoochee watershed; in fact, some 25,000 of the more intelligent constituents of Mayor Hartsfield reside in our county.

I would like to simply stress two points which appeal to me as subject to consideration. One of them goes directly to the matter of permanent defense plants of our country.

In the Chattahoochee watershed there are more permanent military and defense plant installations than in any other similar area in the United States, the installations around Atlanta that Mayor Hartsfield has mentioned, Fort Benning, and all the others down the line.

This Chattahoochee River does constitute the life line of those installations and defense plants.

The four phases of the project which I think have been emphasized are flood control, soil erosion, the raising of the water table, and the production of power.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I think that you have them backward.

I do not mean to criticize at all, but I should think that power would be the greatest advantage that you would gain from the building of this multipurpose dam.

Mr. MCCURDY. I agree with that completely, Senator, but the other items I mentioned might result, if this work is not accomplished, in an eventual reduction of the water flow, which would destroy the usefulness of the river for any of those purposes or for the preservation of the plants that have already been installed along this river and which the Government intends to keep there permanently.

The other item which I would like to mention briefly is this: My county, DeKalb County, contains the largest deposits of granite in the United States—Stone Mountain and the area around Stone Mountain. It is not immediate, but the long-range program involves the eventual development of a waterway toward Atlanta and possibly barge transportation down the Chattahoochee to the Gulf.

For years our county has furnished jetty stones which have protected the harbors of the eastern seaboard on around to New Orleans. They have been shipped by rail at tremendous cost. The eventual development of a waterway by barge transportation would mean a tremendous saving to the Government in years to come in making available to it jetty stones which are continually required in the development and improvement of the harbors.

It seems to me, without going over any of the other matters, that these points certainly should receive the consideration of this committee, and we hope that you can find it possible to include this item in your report.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, sir. We are very much obliged to you.

Mr. MCCURDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative DAVIS. We thank you, Mr. Chairman.

RIVERS AND HARBORS PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Chairman MCKELLAR. The next witness is Congressman Rankin.

Representative RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are coming to you again today asking for an appropriation of at least $5,000,000 for the construction and $100,000 that was knocked out in the House to complete the planning of the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway.

We could not get a roll call in the House because it was in the Committee of the Whole, but, if it is put in here, we can get a roll call in the House, and I think we can sustain it under present conditions.

Conditions have changed in the last few months. In the first place, we do not know where we are headed from the standpoint of war. This project is absolutely necessary for national defense. I want to show you what it will mean.

PURPOSE OF PROJECT

It would mean a slack- or still-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Tennessee River along the Tombigbee, which is about 481 miles, and then a downstream route from that point 215 miles to Paducah on the Tennessee River, and then downstream 47 miles on the Ohio to Cairo. From the Tennessee River, where this project joins the Tennessee River on the Mississippi State line to Cairo, Ill., it is a downstream route of 262 miles. As I said, it is 215 miles to Paducah, and 47 miles from Paducah to Cairo.

Now, we have established our new atomic-bomb plant at Paducah, Ky., in addition to the one at Oak Ridge. We are going to have to take our raw materials to than by water. Nobody knows just how much those materials will amount to, or how much other products it is going to be necessary to take through this Inland Waterway.

It will cut the water distance between the Gulf of Mexico and Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles. It will cut the water distance between the Gulf and the new plant at Paducah by more than 300 miles.

At the same time, it will reduce the cost from the Gulf to the Tennessee River from $2.79 a ton to 62 cents a ton, or on a bargeload or towload of 14,000 tons it will cut the cost of transportation $30,380 on one towload from Mobile to the Tennessee River. That means that on every load that goes to that point or to any other point on the upper Tennessee, it will cut the cost of transportation on every such load going into the Ohio River from $34,580 to $12,460, or $22,120, on its fuel bill alone.

Mr. Chairman, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting a statement I made in the House on this subject, together with a statement I made before this committee, under cross-examination, 2 years ago, in which is included three tables showing the savings which this project would provide for upstream traffic, while saving the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

(The matter referred to was filed with the committee.)

Senator THYE. Mr. Congressman, that argument is just about the same argumeint we put up for the St. Lawrence seaway. Would you concur with us?

Representative RANKIN. I certainly do. I lead the fight for it when I was on the Rivers and Harbors Committee. There are 12 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power going to waste on the St. Lawrence River in that area every year. The people of New York were overcharged $293,683,161 in 1949, according to the Ontario rates.

Again, I think we ought to have a deep-water route into the Great Lakes. We may have to take our Navy in there some day. Besides, you people are entitled to the benefits of cheap transportation.

Does that answer your question, Senator?

Senator THYE. Indeed it does.

REDUCTION OF FREIGHT RATES BY PROJECT

Representative RANKIN. Now, let me bring you down to date on this project, Senator. You have 26 locks and dams on the upper Mississippi River between Cairo and Minneapolis and St. Paul, which gives you virtually a slack-water route all the way. Let me show you what this project would mean to you.

On every bargeload coming by of this route from the Gulf of Mexico into the Mississippi River, that is, going from Mobile to Cairo on one of those 14,000-ton bargeloads—you would cut the cost from $33,460 to $13,300, or a saving of $20,160 on every bargeload of 14,000 tons. That is the load they are coming to now. That would be the amount saved on every such bargeload going from the Gulf at Mobile to La Crosse, Wis., or to Minneapolis or St. Paul.

Senator ECTON. These barges are now going up the Mississippi?

Representative RANKIN. Yes; and they have to fight that swift current in the Mississippi 869 miles, from New Orleans to Cairo. This project will give us a slack-water route and save the swift current of the Mississippi for your downstream traffic.

I am going to bring this home, if you will pardon me just a moment.

This project, as I said, would still save the swift current of the Mississippi for your downstream traffic and give you a slack-water route for returning traffic which would be of tremendous value to the people of that area.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. Ecton] and to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], because you are both in the same area—that there is nothing that I can think of that would be worth more to your States, no other water project will be worth more to those Western States than this one, because you have the possibility of a barge line all the way up to Fort Benton, Mont. That would also get rid of your one-way freight rate with which your people are now punished.

America's greatest wealth, outside of her soil, is her streams.

When I came to Congress for the first time the American people used only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year they used 329,000,000,000, approximately 10 times as much, and there is an increasing demand every year.

Besides, you people are punished with a one-way freight rate. You are treated like conquered provinces. I am not saying anything to you that I would not say to the Interstate Commerce Commission

today. It costs you twice as much to ship certain processed goods from Montana, North Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, any of those States into this area east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio as it does to ship the same material to you, from behind the iron curtain of discriminatory freight rates.

I know, because a man in my town was doing business with a firm in New Hampshire. That firm shipped him a consignment of goods by mistake. He pasted a new label over the one on it and shipped it back over the same road. It cost him twice as much to ship it back as it did to ship it down there.

A city in my district undertook to build a small plant—and this would happen in your State, Senator, and your State, Senator.

Senator THYE. We have fought it for years, but it seems they have us hamstrung.

Representative RANKIN. We have them on the run now.

They found that the one way freight would penalize them $550,000 a year. That would happen in Arizona, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Florida, Louisiana, Tennessee, Colorado, North Dakota, Montana, Minnesota, or any other State south of the Ohio River or west of the Mississippi. The outfit that is fighting this proposition is the railroad lobbyists that do not want you to get cheap water rates into those areas.

To go from Mobile to Cairo, this would cut the cost from $2.39 a ton down to 95 cents a ton. It would cut the cost on a 14,000-ton barge from $33,460 down to $13,300 or a saving of $20,160 on the fuel bill alone. They do not want you to have that cheap freight rate because it is going to make them readjust their rates and get rid of this one way freight rate to which I referred. It will do more to get rid of that one way freight rate than anything else that has yet been done.

It will not put any railroad men out of work. They will haul more freight and hire more men, when these adjustments are made.

When they built this Tombigbee-Warrior project up to Birmingham, Ala., they provided a barge line to Birmingham on the Warrior River. That gave them water rates. They haul three times as much freight by rail to and from Birmingham now as they did when that service was first begun. This project will have the same affect. It will do more to get rid of that one way freight rate that you and I are punished with than any other thing I could mention.

Senator YOUNG. I do not believe that river navigation is possible above Sioux City when these dams are all completed.

General CHORPENING. It is authorized as far as Sioux City at this time. It would be done at some later date if that appeared feasible.

Senator YOUNG. How would you get past the dams of Gavins Point and Fort Randall?

General CHORPENING. There would have to be some lateral canals with locks.

Senator YOUNG. It could be installed later?

General CHORPENING. They could be installed; yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. At very much additional cost?

General CHORPENING. It would cost additional money, of course, but it is feasibile from an engineering standpoint. That is the answer to your question, it is feasible if the commerce is there to justify it.

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNAL WATERWAY SYSTEM

Representative RANKIN. Senator, it would not have cost as much to build all the dams necessary from the Mississippi River to Fort Benton, Mont., as this country is now spending building power dams in Israel, or in Switzerland. It is about time we looked after the American people awhile and not continue to waste money in this foreign extravagance while denying our own people the benefits that would come from this missing link in our internal waterway system.

This project will give us a slack water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes. We have already built the Illinois River and changed the course of it, so that it is a slack water route all the way. This project would provide what would amount to a slack water route from the Gulf of Mexico into the Great Lakes, and all the points of the Great Lakes. It would be one of the greatest things that could happen to those States that border on the Great Lakes. Now I am coming to one of the most important points, and that is, the Ohio River.

We need not kid ourselves—if we keep on we may find ourselves involved in a universal war and be driven back on our own shores.

As I told the boys in the House, I live in a country that lost a war once, and I know what it means. We may be driven back on our own shores, defending our own country. If we do, nothing will be more important than this inland waterway.

Where are our steel plants located? Where are our aluminum plants located. They are in the Pittsburgh area, largely—and along the Great Lakes, the Ohio River and other streams that will be served by this project.

The Aluminum Co. of America is getting 95 percent of its bauxite from South America, because the bauxite that we have in Arkansas will not supply the demand. I understand the Arkansas supply is on the decline now.

UPSTREAM BARGE FREIGHT RATES

Every bargeload of that bauxite going to Pittsburgh, or to ALCOA, or up the Missouri, or up the Illinois, or into the Great Lakes, on each bargeload you would save all the way from $20,160 a bargeload to $30,380 a 14,000-ton-bargeload—save that amount just on the fuel bill alone.

Now, that is the great aluminum producing area, and yet they are getting that bauxite from South America, and are going to have to get it from South America from now on, because we do not have the supply.

By the way, when I told a Congressman from Iowa about this proposition, that this small plant in my district would have to pay $550,000 a year overcharges for the one-way freight, he said that would happen in Iowa, or in Nebraska, or any other Western State. He said, "We are treated as conquered Provinces, just as you are, when it comes to the freight rate proposition."

Now, let us see what it is here: Our great steel mills are in Pittsburgh. Do you know where Pittsburgh is going to have to go to get her steel from now on? Her iron ore? There are only two sources left.

Senator THYE. I think I know. Minnesota has a very large amount of iron ore. We will be shipping you iron ore for a good many years to come.

Representative RANKIN. All right. In addition to that, Labrador and Venezuela. They have discovered the greatest iron-ore production in the world, the greatest high-grade iron-ore deposit in the world, in Venezuela. These steel mills—I know this applies to the United States Steel Corp.—have gone down and bought interests in that great Venezuelan deposit.

This project will provide a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico all the way up to Pittsburgh, Pa. Why? Because it provides a slack-water route up to the Tennessee River and a downstream route on the Tennessee River from there to Paducah, 215 miles, and then you have 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River between Cairo and Pittsburgh, Pa., which give you slack water on the Ohio all the way up to Pittsburgh, at least nine-tenths of the time.

This project will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf to Pittsburgh and, at the same time, it will save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

One outfit in Detroit wrote me that they were hauling automobiles down to the Ohio River, and shipping them down the Mississippi. But they said they wanted to bring back oil. Well, I got to looking into it, to see what they would save on bringing this oil back.

In Jasper County, Miss., just a short distance from Demopolis, they have brought in the largest oil well ever brought in east of the Mississippi. It is the only one producing 1,000 barrels a day. They could take that oil from Demopolis into the Tennessee River over this route and cut the cost from $43,120 on a 14,000-ton bargeload to $4,760, saving $38,360 on the fuel bill alone. To take it to Paducah, it would cut the cost from $38,640 down to $8,540, or a saving of $30,100 on a 14,000-ton bargeload—just on its fuel bill.

If it is going on into your area, it would cut it from $41,440 from Mobile to Cairo, to $13,300, or a saving of $28,140, on its fuel bill alone.

Now, that is what it would mean to all that area, from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Fort Benning, Mont., and to all of the other points, Indianapolis, Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Sioux City—all that whole area. This is the missing link. It is the missing link in our internal water system, and it is a missing link in our national defense program.

We are going to have to take materials into Oak Ridge. We are going to have to take materials into Paducah. We are going to have to bring bauxite from South America, and we are going to have to take some of the iron ore that they are going to use in Pittsburgh in the steel mills.

We are going to have to take the materials that they use on the upper Mississippi, the Ohio, the Illinois, the Great Lakes, and on the Missouri through this slack-water route. There is not a chance for them to stop this development permanently. All they are doing is delaying it when it should have been constructed long ago. Our boys are dying in Korea today for the want of the very instruments and materials this project would help to provide.

This project will be worth more to the people of that great area than anything else I could think of, as well as your State, Senator Thye, and all the rest of the States involved.

LENGTH OF TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE RIVER

Senator HOLLAND. For the record, how far is it by river mileage, from the mouth of the Tombigbee into the connection with the Tennessee River?

Representative RANKIN. It is 481 miles, I believe, from the Intercoastal Waterway, below Mobile, to the Tennessee River.

Senator HOLLAND. How far is it from the mouth of the Mississippi to that same spot, that is, up the Mississippi, and then up the Ohio and up the Tennessee?

Representative RANKIN. 1,131 miles, and every inch of it upstream.

Senator HOLLAND. How far is it that the deep cut will be required to get from the Tombigbee into the Tennessee River?

Representative RANKIN. You see here [pointing to the map], this is Yellow Creek which flows into the Tennessee River. The water is already backed up in it.

This is Mackeys Creek, the chief branch of the Tombigbee and they are within 5 miles of each other.

Of course, they will have to be widened and deepened. I would say that that cut will probably have to be from 10 to 20 miles long. It is not more than 30 miles from the last lock and dam on the Tombigbee, or on Mackey's Creek, its chief tributary to the Tennessee River down Yellow Creek. The Tennessee River is 100 feet above the Tombigbee.

ORIGINAL TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

Senator HOLLAND. What is the Engineers' estimate of the Tombigbee project.

Representative RANKIN. The estimate, at the time it was first authorized was $136,000,000. I think the Army engineers state now that, owing to the advance in the prices, it will cost $160,000,000.

General CHORPENING. It would cost $180,000,000 based on 1950 prices.

Senator HOLLAND. How many locks would there be?

Representative RANKIN. The original program was for 18 locks and dams. That is right, is it not?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir, and we are now planning on 10.

Representative RANKIN. Ten locks and dams.

Senator HOLLAND. That will give a slackwater route all the way from the Intercoastal Waterway to the conjunction with the Tennessee?

Representative RANKIN. That is correct.

By the way, I want the engineers to hear me—and if I make a mistake, I want them to call me down, because I do not want to mislead this committee. If I am not right, I want to know it.

Over half of this project is already finished. We have it built from the Gulf to Demopolis already, and are now building the Demopolis Dam which will back the water up to Gainesville, Ala.

Gainesville, Ala., if you will take the map out and look at it—I do not care to take up the committee's time with a recitation of these things—is 275 miles above Mobile, and I believe, 301 miles above the Intercoastal Waterway.

In other words, you have 301 miles already finished of the 481 miles, you see. So you would only have about 180 miles to finish.

This Demopolis Dam is now under way and will back the water up to above Gainesville, which is 60 or 70 miles above Demopolis.

DEPTH OF CHANNEL

Senator HOLLAND. What is the depth of the channel?

Representative RANKIN. Nine feet. That is sufficient to carry these barges.

Senator ECTON. And that will take the largest barges?

Representative RANKIN. Yes, sir.

By the way, we are providing in here, Senator—and let me say to you gentlemen on the Missouri and the upper Mississippi, whatever locks they put in in the future, make them 110 by 600 feet, because that is the size of the locks on the Mississippi River, on the Ohio, and on the lower Tennessee, from this point on the map where this project connects with the Tennessee down to Paducah. We are making these 110 by 600 so they will carry all the traffic that will be traveling into these streams.

Now, Senator, there was a man on the Corps of Engineers, General Robbins, who made this statement before the committee:

He said: "If I were to tell you that I could take the money provided and build locks up the Mississippi and extend a slack-water route to Cairo, you would throw up your hats and cheer."

"Yet," he said, "this is much better than that, because it gives us a slackwater route to that point, and saves the swift current of the Mississippi for your downstream traffic."

The greatest waterway on earth for downstream traffic is the Mississippi River, and it is about the worst for upstream traffic.

Senator ECTON. There are locks in that stretch of the Mississippi, into the Gulf of Mexico?

Representative RANKIN. No; no, indeed. There are no locks at all on the Mississippi below Cairo. They are not needed.

Senator HOLLAND. There is too much water.

Representative RANKIN. Let me give you another statement that General Robbins made that I think is one of the most significant of any that I have heard.

They asked him what about this project from the standpoint of national defense, and General Robbins made this statement:

> Unquestionably, if this waterway were in operation today, it would be a tremendous value for national defense; but you cannot put a money value on it any more than you can put a value on winning the war.

General Robbins said that before this committee in 1944, the year, I believe, that we were trying to get, and were getting, funds for the planning.

PLANNING FUNDS EXPENDED TO DATE

We have already spent over $600,000 on the planning, have we not, General?

General CHORPENING. That is about right.

Senator HOLLAND. What is the average rate of flow of the main stream of the Mississippi?

Representative RANKIN. I believe it is from 2½ miles up to 7 miles an hour. It is from 5 to 7 miles per hour in a large portion of the year. I think the average is a little above 2½ miles.

Now, a barge in slack-water travels 5½ miles per hour; is that not correct?

General CHORPENING. I think some of the modern equipment travels faster than that, Congressman.

Representative RANKIN. Well, somebody testified before the committee that it was not over 5½ miles per hour.

DISTANCE BETWEEN MOBILE AND MOUTH OF TOMBIGBEE RIVER

Senator YOUNG. How many miles is it to the mouth of the Tombigbee?

Representative RANKIN. About 130 miles from New Orleans. By the way, that is a slack-water route. That Intercoastal Waterway is behind the chain of islands.

Senator ELLENDER. You mean Mobile, do you not?

Senator YOUNG. Well, wherever this slack route would turn north.

Representative RANKIN. It is about 130 miles to where it joins this route. Then it is 26 miles up to Mobile.

Senator HOLLAND. All the way through the Intercoastal Waterway?

Representative RANKIN. It is on this map here. I will give you the distance.

Senator HOLLAND. In other words, it does not have to go out to the mouth of the Mississippi and into the open water of the Gulf at all?

Representative RANKIN. No; it can go across that Intercoastal Waterway. The Intercoastal Waterway is protected by a chain of islands. It goes through the Mississippi Sound and it is slack water all the time.

There is no trouble about getting across here from New Orleans to Mobile.

Another thing that is important is that this saving will apply to every vessel that comes from anywhere along the Intercoastal Waterway, from Brownsville, Tex., on the Mexican border, over here to——

Senator HOLLAND. Carrabelle, Fla.

Representative RANKIN. That is right, Carrabelle, Fla. It will apply to all of them because it is the missing link. It is the missing link in the greatest inland waterway system on earth. I cannot understand why anybody would oppose the appropriation necessary to speed up its construction with all possible haste.

This is the only possible way, Senators—the only possible way—that you can ever provide a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to points on the Tennessee, the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, the Great Lakes, and the Missouri.

It is the only possible way that you can ever provide a slack-water route to all those points and, at the same time, it saves the swift current of the Mississippi for your downstream traffic.

AMENDMENT REQUESTED

Senator ELLENDER. Congressman, may I make this observation: That your difficulty has not been with this committee. Your difficulty is with the House.

Representative RANKIN. I know it, but if we can get this amendment in now I feel sure we can hold it. The Demopolis Dam is under construction and I feel sure the same machinery would be used on the Gainesville Dam.

Senator ELLENDER. But you made those statements the last time; I remember distinctly.

Representative RANKIN. We have had no trouble with this committee.

Senator ELLENDER. I know that.

Representative RANKIN. And if we can get it in this time, I feel confident we can get it sustained on a roll call in the House because conditions are developing so rapidly and it has become more important, and the people are demanding it more than ever before.

Now I would like to answer any questions that any of you may have in your minds.

LENGTH OF TIME TO COMPLETE PROJECT

Senator YOUNG. How many years would it take to complete this?

Representative RANKIN. Three years, they say; is that not it, General?

General CHORPENING. I think it would take longer than that, on what would be the most economical schedule, that we propose to have.

If the Congress wished to have it expedited, yes; I think after planning is completed we could build it in from 3 to 4 years. That would not be the most economical schedule.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any other questions, gentlemen?

Representative RANKIN. Let me say another thing.

AMOUNT REQUESTED FOR PLANNING

General, you have spent over $600,000 on the planning, and you need $100,000 to complete the planning; is that not correct?

General CHORPENING. We asked for $100,000 this year. The budget included that to continue the planning. That will not complete all of the planning, but with that amount we would complete plans and specifications on the Gainesville lock so that we could award a construction contract on the Gainesville lock and continue planning on other features of the project.

Chairman MCKELLAR. How much does the budget provide?

General CHORPENING. The budget estimate is for $100,000 for planning.

Representative RANKIN. In other words, General, let me ask you this question:

If this appropriation is made you can begin construction of the Gainesville lock right now?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

Representative RANKIN. And use the machinery that is being used to build the Demopolis Dam?

General CHORPENING. Well, we would have to advertise the work.

Representative RANKIN. I understand that.

General CHORPENING. If that contractor was low bidder, he would get the job.

Representative RANKIN. Yes; and the chances are he would be the low bidder.

General CHORPENING. He may have an advantage.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF PLANNING

Senator ELLENDER. General, how much more money would it require to complete the plans for the entire project?

General CHORPENING. It would take a number of million dollars, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. No; I am talking about the planning.

General CHORPENING. That is correct. You see, on each of these locks and dams we have to make detailed plans. Furthermore, the cut—you asked me to correct you, sir—the land cut is 27 miles in length between where we go across the high ground to get up into the Tennessee system.

Representative RANKIN. Twenty-seven miles from the Tennessee River.

Senator ELLENDER. Congressman Rankin stated, as I recall, that we have already spent or appropriated $600,000 for planning.

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. And how much more will it cost merely for planning?

General CHORPENING. About 4½ million for the over-all planning.

Representative RANKIN. But that is the planning for constructing each dam. That should really be charged as a part of the construction costs. For the preliminary planning, it would only cost about $100,000.

General CHORPENING. We should progressively go with the construction of the first one, and as we go along with the remainder, we should plan them as we proceed.

Represenative RANKIN. In other words, that is included in the $180,000,000?

General CHORPENING. That is correct.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Rankin is so impressive about your downstream flow on the Mississippi and then your slack water on the Tombigbee and the Tennessee. Is there any place else in the world that such a situation would exist?

Representative RANKIN. Yes, sir. I wish I had a world map here. The only other one is between the Don and the Volga in Russia, and Stalin is speeding up its construction with all possible haste. It would not amount to as much as this, because it will not provide the slack-water route for the same distance, but it does give them a tremendous advantage in transportation. I sometimes wonder if we are not paying for that in lend-lease money, and if they are not building it with lend-lease machinery.

If we had this in any other country in the world, I do not think we would have any trouble getting this money—from the way we are spending it abroad now.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Did I understand you correctly to mention the Don and Volga Rivers in Russia?

Represenative RANKIN. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. If I may, I would like to ask General Chorpening a question?

Why is it that the costs are so much to develop these plans? I realize you have to have a specific blueprint for each and every lock, but do you not build all these locks according to the same type of plans and the same specifications, and the main planning is the survey, and all, on how to place them and where to place them?

TOTAL ESTIMATE COST OF PROJECT

General CHORPENING. I would like to answer that in this fashion: We have here a project that is estimated to cost $180,000,000.

Now, we state that the total planning requirement will be $4,000,000 to $5,000,000. Percentagewise, that is not very much.

Now we will use the plans of one lock and dam insofar as we can, on another one, but we encounter different foundation conditions at every location. We must make extensive borings and extensive design work to be sure that for that locatioin we have the proper kind of structure. It might vary. We might have some of them of one type of construction, and others of another type, because they must fit into the topography.

Representative RANKIN. Of course, when General Wheeler was head of the Army engineers, he estimated that this project would cost $136,000,000, and that included whatever they would have to spend in planning, looking after the location, and the structure of these dams. But, so far as the preliminary planning is concerned, $100,000 is all they need to finish what has already been started.

Of course, when it comes to building these dams, they are going to have to see that those dams are built according to the instruction of the Army engineers, whoever is in charge of them.

CHANNEL CUT-OFF FROM TOMBIGBEE TO TENNESSEE RIVER

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Rankin, the feasibility of cutting this channel there from the Tombigbee across to the Tenessee was made much more feasible, was it not—I mean to reduce the cost—through the Pickwick Dam?

I think it would be interesting to explain that. Senator McKellar was connected with the Pickwick Dam.

Representative RANKIN. I will do that.

This project has been under consideration for more than 100 years. The Army engineers always turned it down, for the simple reason that this small sand ridge here separates Yellow Creek that goes into the Tennessee from MacKeys Creek, that forms the Tombigbee, when it joins Browns Creek, and they would have had to have lifts both ways, and there was no water supply to summit. You have to have a water supply at the summit before you can ever operate a lock.

The Panama Canal is 85 feet above sea level. We had to go up and get the Chagres River and change the course of it to flow into Gatun Lake to get the necessary water supply. That water does not come from the ocean.

PICKWICK DAM, TENN.

In 1938, the Pickwick Dam was built, where I am now pointing on the map, just below where this project enters the Tennessee River.

This Pickwick Dam across the Tennessee River raised the water level 50 or 55 feet at the mouth of Yellow Creek.

Senator STENNIS. You do not mean it raised it from 50 to 55 feet, but it raised it that many feet.

Representative RANKIN. Raised it 50 or 55 feet above what it was. That water is about 50 or 55 feet deep, whereas, heretofore, it was a shoal, you might say.

The Army engineers then made another survey, and when they came back, they were the most enthusiastic group I have ever talked to.

They said that had solved the problem.

They said, "We can cut through that sand ridge now and put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River, and have all the water from the State lines of Virginia and North Carolina down, if necessary, to supply these locks."

So that made it possible. It solved the whole problem. The Army engineers and other engineers had been quibbling over the task for 150 years. It makes it the most feasible project on earth, and the only one where you can transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another, with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances. It means more to about half or two-thirds of the States of this Union, you might say, than any other project of its kind that has ever been proposed.

The nearest one to it in comparison anywhere on earth is the one connecting the Don and Volga Rivers in Russia, the construction of which Russia is now speeding up with all possible haste. I do not know what she is up to, but somebody said the other day that we are probably paying for it with lend-lease money. I do not know. But I am told that we are building dams in Switzerland with Marshall-plan money. Switzerland never was in either war.

REMAINDER OF PROJECT TO BE COMPLETED

You are building projects in Israel, Asia, and throughout the world, with American money, and here we are with this project over half developed, you might say, just about 168 miles to finish, and it means more to the American people from the standpoint of transportation, and from the standpoint of national defense, than any other project that has ever been proposed.

Senator HOLLAND. You mean from Demopolis to the junction of the Tennessee River is 168 miles?

Representative RANKIN. I think it is about 168 miles from Gainesville to where the water is backed up by the Demopolis Dam to the Tennessee River.

Now, of course, they are going to have to widen Yellow Creek, that is true. That is going to have to be widened and deepened, but it will not be very much, because it is in the backwater of the Tennessee River, which already comes up to the foot of this ridge right here on the map [indicating.]

But, at the very best, this route is over half built, over half of the route from the Intercoastal Waterway to the Tennessee is now constructed, and there is not any reason on earth why we should delay this project and paralyze, or maintain the paralysis of this type of water transportation.

EFFECT OF WATERWAY ON PICKWICK DAM POWER PRODUCTION

Chairman McKellar. I would like to ask you a question:

To what extent would the water from Pickwick Dam have any effect on this?

Representative Rankin. Senator, we consulted the TVA on that any they said it would not be very much. TVA approved this project.

Chairman McKellar. General, what do you have to say about that?

General Chorpening. That is correct, sir. Pickwick Dam, being there, makes this project feasible.

Chairman McKellar. That is not what I am asking. I am asking to what extent would it interfere with the Pickwick Dam? There is a tremendous power dam there. If the waters were turned into the Tombigbee River from the Pickwick Dam, would it not interfere with the power production of that dam?

General Chorpening. It would not interfere to any appreciable extent, because the amount of water that would be required is very nominal.

We would have a lock there; the Tennessee River would not be flowing into the Tombigbee; the requirements for a lock are nominal.

Senator Ellender. You take water only when that lock is in operation.

General Chorpening. That is correct. I think I may have the exact figures on that.

Representative Rankin. Mr. Chairman, I have them in here somewhere, with a statement by Lilienthal, who was at that time the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He stated that it would cost very little, and that the TVA was in favor of it, because it would take very little of the water out of the Tennessee River.

The truth of it is that it would only take the water that you would need out of the Tennessee River to supply the first lock.

General Chorpening. I have the exact information here. It is on page 72 of the project document.

Of course, the amount of water that is required will depend on the number of lockings per day. I will read the requirements for 24 lockages per day. It is stated that it would require 818 acre-feet per day. That is not a great amount of water.

Chairman McKellar. All right, sir.

Representative Rankin. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to answer any other questions.

Chairman McKellar. Are there any other questions, gentlemen?

AMOUNT REQUESTED

Senator Ecton. Before he starts, I would like to ask Congressman Rankin one question.

How much money do you want?

Representative Rankin. I want $100,000 to complete this preliminary planning, and then I want $5,000,000 to start the work.

Senator Ecton. $5,100,000?

Representative Rankin. That is right.

Chairman McKellar. Before you start, Congressman, Congressman Boykin was scheduled to be one of the witnesses here. Do you know where he is, or why he cannot come?

Representative Rankin. He said he could not be here, but he asked us to get permission for him to extend his remarks in the record.

I want to insert a statement by Mr. Herlong, of Florida, and state that we have with us a distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Eberharter. I would like for him to make a statement, if he wishes.

Chairman McKellar. The statement to which you referred, without objection, will be inserted in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

I have been asked by the congressional delegation of Florida to express our interest in the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway. This inland waterway would make possible the marketing of many Florida vegetables as well as manufactured goods in the Midwestern States. At present this is not possible, due to the discriminatory freight rates.

It is my understanding that when the dam at Demopolis now under construction has been completed more than one-half of the inland waterway will be finished. In view of the loss incurred when a construction project is abandoned, coupled with the fact that this waterway would open the industrial doors of the South to the Midwestern States, I sincerely hope that the committee will find this project economically justified, and in this hope I am joined by the other members of the Florida congressional delegation.

STATEMENT OF HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Representative Eberharter. Of course, I cannot add very much to the very able presentation already made by Congressman Rankin. He has lived with this project for years.

I do want to say to the committee, though, that I am of the firm opinion that this project has real merit, and I think that if the committee and this Congress would approve this project in a wholehearted manner, and put up sufficient money to go ahead with it, it would be remembered as a Congress that really did something worthwhile for the commerce, for the country.

Chairman McKellar. That is very regrettable to us, that none of the Congresses for the last few years have done anything of advantage to the United States. You are entirely welcome. I think you have done something for the United States. I am sorry you feel that way about the Congress.

This is in order to accomplish something. We have not been accomplishing anything. I am sorry you feel that way.

Representative Eberharter. I said it is a mistake that the project has not gone ahead faster.

Representative Rankin. He was referring to this project alone, Senator.

Chairman McKellar. You did not limit it to this project.

Representative Eberharter. I am sorry, Senator. Of course, I meant no reflection whatsoever.

Chairman McKellar. You consider it very strongly, anyway. Go ahead.

Representative Eberharter. I have always believed very firmly in water development, and I think this is a wise project and a farseeing project, and would be of great benefit to the country, industrially and economically, if it was pushed faster.

Thank you, Senator.

Chairman McKellar. All right.

Representative Rankin. Are there any questions?

Senator Stennis. What was the Congressman's area?

Representative Eberharter. Pittsburgh, Pa.

Representative Rankin. Mr. Eberharter, what would be the effect on the Pittsburgh area?

Representative Eberharter. Of course, it would be a tremendous value to the future development of the steel industry and the advance in all of the various manufacturing establishments in that area, not only western Pennsylvania, but of Ohio and Indiana and so forth.

Chairman McKellar. All right.

Representative Rankin. Mr. Chairman, I desire to present now the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Marshall.

Chairman McKellar. All right, Mr. Marshall, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRED MARSHALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Representative Marshall. Mr. Chairman, I know how hard your committee has labored, and it is past the hour that most people quit work, in the forenoon.

I merely want to say this: Coming from the upper Mississippi River region, from where I come, we are interested in anything that will provide for a more efficient transportation system. We are the furthest west from the markets, from any point in the United States, the market of our products.

Furthermore, we are also interested in conserving the natural resources of this country. We believe that, by providing a slack-water route, that that will save some of the fuel costs that we now engage in by bucking the rapid stream of the Mississippi in coming upstream.

Unless the committee has some questions that they would like to ask me, I have nothing further to say.

Senator Stennis. That is a good statement.

Chairman McKellar. We are very much obliged to you.

Representative Rankin. Mr. Chairman, we have with us now, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Elliott, whom I would like to present to the committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL ELLIOTT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ALABAMA

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Representative Elliott. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with what Mr. Rankin has said about the development of this project. I urge your approval of these amounts, which have been asked for.

Chairman McKellar. What part of Alabama do you come from?

Representative Elliott. I come from Jasper, sir.

We appreciate this opportunity to appear before you. Due to the hour, I request permission to extend my remarks.

Chairman McKellar. We will be very happy for you to do that.

Representative Rankin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the other members may extend their remarks in the record.

I would like to extend my remarks, and to include a speech which I made in the House, which includes the cross-examination before this committee before, and contains the tables that I referred to.

Chairman McKellar. Without objection, the material referred to may be filed with the committee.)

Representative Rankin. I request permission also for Mr. Battle, Mr. Bob Jones, of Alabama, and several other members probably, from Pennsylvania, Alabama, and Kentucky, and Ohio to place their remarks in the record.

Senator Stennis. Mr. Chairman, may I say this: I am very much interested in this project, but I would not ask the committee to stay longer now. I do want to have a word with the subcommittee on it before we do conclude.

Let me point out, if I may, before Mr. Rankin leaves, that although this construction, a great part of it, is in his congressional district, I think the map thoroughly demonstrates that this is not a local project, it is a national project.

Representative Rankin. From the standpoint of dollars and cents, it will be worth more to Pittsburgh, Pa. It will be worth more to Pittsburgh, Pa., than it will be to my district, although it goes through the district, that is true, and will help us get rid of this one-way freight rate. But it will be worth more to Pittsburgh and the Illinois River and the Great Lakes than it will be to my district.

Senator Stennis. Mr. Rankin has worked on this for a long time, and I think it is for a national service.

Representative Rankin. Thank you very much, gentlemen. You have been very kind and very considerate, and I want you to know that we appreciate it.

Chairman McKellar. We appreciate your appearing here today.

We will recess the hearing until Monday at 10:30. At this point I would like to insert in the record a statement on the Houston ship channel in Texas.

HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TEX.

(See p. 610)

I. THE AREA AND THE PROBLEM

The Harris County flood control district covers an area of 1,747 square miles. It had a 1950 population of 806,701, increasing at a phenomenal rate. The city of Houston is located in its approximate center.

It is the hub and center of the Gulf Coast industrial area, and of the oil natural gas, and chemical industries, all related directly to, and forming an essential part of, vital defense projects.

Repetition of this area's flood of 1935 would be the equivalent of an atomic bomb dropped on the city of Houston in terms of the disruption and loss of production in the locality. Many of the new industries, particularly chemicals and oil, have been established since 1935.

The project, in support of which this statement is submitted, involves a higher percentage of local and State participation than any with which the undersigned are familiar. The citizens of Harris County and the city of Houston, included within the area of the flood-control district, are prepared to assume this high percentage of local responsibility, for carrying through this protective project. Historically, control of floods has been a function in which the Federal Government has properly recognized and assumed a major responsibility. Here, however, the citizens of the State and the locality have contributed far beyond the normal local contributions.

The watershed of the district is composed almost entirely of the rivers known as Buffalo Bayou and its tributaries, Brays, Sims, and White Oak Bayous, the word "bayou" being the local name for "river." The lower 15 miles of Buffalo Bayou form the port of Houston and include the important Houston ship channel. Buffalo and White Oak Bayous join in the center of the city of Houston. Brays and Sims join Buffalo just below the city. The $100 million medical center has just been established along Brays Bayou in the city of Houston.

Industries along the banks of the ship channel on the lower reaches of the bayou represent an investment of more than $1,100,000,000. These are comprised almost wholly of vital defense industries in the form of oil refineries and chemical industries. In addition to a number of other refineries, it includes one of the largest in the world at Baytown.

In addition, there are a large number of defense and other industries on the light-draft section of Buffalo Bayou and its tributaries, upstream from the turning basin of the port. Industries engaged in the manufacturing of airplane parts, guns, gun barrels, trucks, tanks, and other vital war production are included, as well as oil and chemicals. Over 35,000,000 tons of petroleum and petroleum products are handled by the port annually.

The entire area, though small when compared to some other river systems, is subjected to unusual heavy torrential rainfall conditions accompanying Gulf cyclonic disturbances. It has been visited by the most severe storms ever recorded in the United States. Among these may be mentioned the floods of 1929 and 1935, which caused damage to the city and the port of Houston of $1,400,000 and $2,600,000 respectively. In the 1935 storm, within the city limits of that date, the inundations covered an estimated 2,400 acres, including 25 blocks in the main business area and 100 blocks in highly developed residential areas.

Since 1935 the city of Houston and Harris County have experienced phenomenal growth. Both industrial and residential developments have had a tendency to follow rivers and streams as natural carriers of commerce and intercourse. Through the construction of streets, storm sewers, and other drainage facilities which accompanied this development, hydraulic conditions have been created which increase the adverse characteristics of flooding. The standard of a design storm based upon statistics and engineering data for streams in this region far exceeds the 1935 storm, but if the 1935 storm should recur under present conditions, the direct damages along Buffalo Bayou and its principal tributaries named would exceed $50,000,000, and the indirect damages would be more than $20,000,000, a total of over $70,000,000, as compared to approximately $3,000,000 in 1935. Based upon present industrial and domestic development and using the type of storm which is necessary as a basis for adequate flood-control design, with the stream channels in their present condition, engineers estimate the direct and indirect property damages would probably exceed $200,000,000.

A small storm occurred on Brays Bayou in October 1949. It caused direct damages of more than $5,000,000. Development and growth of this area has nevertheless tremendously increased. A similar comparatively small storm can be anticipated to occur on an average frequency of about every 5 years. Such a limited storm would now result in average annual damages of more than $2,000,000. This damage will be increased in future storms because of new construction and development.

Engineering analyses and economic surveys in 1950 show annual direct damages due to floods in Houston and Harris County on Buffalo, Brays, Sims, and White Oak Bayous of approximately $4,000,000, a total annual loss of about $18,000,000.

Inadequate flood-control measures caused the 1935 storm to deposit unusual quantities of silt and soil in and along the waterways, materially increasing the maintenance cost. Proper protection against recurrence is essential to avoid heavy maintenance charges.

The Port of Houston was the second deep sea port of the Nation in 1948 and 1949, based on official commercial statistics reported by the Army Chief of Engineers. 1950 figures have not yet been issued, but the port's own statistics show an increase of more than 5,000,000 tons in 1950 and 1951 tonnage running more than 13 percent higher than 1950.

Recurrence of disastrous floods interferes materially with the transport of defense cargoes to and from numerous industries along the ship channel, and disrupts the flow of supplies and stocks from one industry to another.

Engineering estimates of the cost of flood-control measures essential to eliminate all danger from floods on these streams shows an estimated cost of approximately $70,000,000. About $11,000,000 has been spent to date. About $60,000,000 is required to complete necessary flood-control measures. Such a project would pay for itself every 4 or 5 years, and is thoroughly justified economically.

II. PAST PROTECTIVE MEASURES

Following the 1935 storm, the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate adopted a resolution, February 20, 1936, requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports on the Houston ship channel with a view to improvement of the channel and its protection from the deposit of silt, etc. In accordance with this resolution and under authority of the flood-control act approved June 22, 1936, the Secretary of War submitted a report to the Congress on December 11, 1937, recommending the treatment of the flood problem as now covered by the existing Federal project.

The existing flood-control project (H. Doc. No. 453, 75th Cong., 2d sess., and the Definite Project Report of July 1940 by the Corps of Engineers) considered the improvement of Buffalo Bayou and tributaries above the turning basin of the port of Houston and excluded any specific consideration of flood conditions on Brays and Sims Bayous below the turning basin. The various features of the existing project are as follows:

(a) Barker Dam and Reservoir.
(b) Addicks Dam and Reservoir.
(c) Channel improvement below Barker and Addicks Dams.
(d) White Oak Dam and Reservoir.
(e) North Canal—diversion from White Oak Reservoir.
(f) Brickhouse gully bypass channel.
(g) South canal—diversion from rectified channel below Barker and Addicks Dams.
(h) Removal of obstructions in city of Houston.

Barker and Addicks Dams and Reservoirs have been completed with required rectification of the channel of Buffalo Bayou below the dams. Local interests contributed directly $2,900,000 of the approximate cost of $11,000,000, and indirectly contributed and are contributing approximately $15,000,000 for drainage as related to flood control. Nevertheless discharges from uncontrolled watersheds below these dams, plus discharges from the reservoirs formed by the dams, can, and will cause serious damaging flood conditions on Buffalo Bayou in the city of Houston, in the turning basin and in the ship channel. The existing project excluded any consideration of alleviation of damages along Brays and Sims Bayous. Since the project was initiated, these areas have become of great importance due to rapid growth and development.

Local interests requested the Corps of Engineers to review project recommendations and determine whether the existing project remained adequate for treatment of the flood-control problem. As a result, by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives adopted July 16, 1945, and resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted April 20, 1948, the Corps of Engineers was authorized to restudy the flood-control problems and to consider those tributary streams not theretofore investigated.

The Corps of Engineers limited their initial reinvestigation to Buffalo, Brays, and White Oak Bayous. Local interests have subsequently requested that like consideration be given Sims Bayou.

III. PROPOSED CONTINUED PROTECTIVE WORK

A modification of the existing project is feasible and economically justified under all engineering data and statistics available. Such a modification of the remaining features of the existing project not yet constructed would include

clearing, straightening, enlarging, and lining, where required, Buffalo, Brays, and White Oak Bayous and the construction of a desilting basin and structure in Buffalo Bayou above the turning basin for protection of the port, and to reduce maintenance dredging. It is understood that so far as can be determined, the restudy of the interim report by the Corps of Engineers supports such action. It is also understood that the recommended improvement of Buffalo, Brays, and White Oak Bayous for flood control is estimated to cost approximately $50,000,000, excluding work already completed, and that $25,000,000 of this amount represents costs to be assumed by local interests.

Storms in this area, with resultant excessive rainfall, are certain. Larger storms occurring at frequent intervals would completely disrupt industry and business of the city and port of Houston. Uninterrupted conduct of these vital defense needs is essential to the State and Nation. The rapidly accelerating development at a phenomenal rate continues. Increased rate of run-off, with inadequate capacity of the main streams, creates a potentiality of high loss of lives and property under large storm conditions. Adequate planning and carrying out of protective measures is imperative. Scope of the plans already made should be enlarged. Modifications should be made promptly and expeditiously to adapt the prosecution of the work to changed conditions.

It is earnestly requested that your committee give consideration to immediate appropriation of funds for planning and continued construction on Buffalo Bayou of not less than $1,000,000 at this session of Congress. We most earnestly petition that early authorization be given by Congress to the recommended work contained in the review report prepared by the Corps of Engineers, including adequate provision for flood control on Brays Bayou. Local interests will pledge adequate contributions to prosecution of the work.

We have endeavored to include the essentials of the matter in the foregoing to illustrate the importance of adequate and proper measures of protection. The undersigned stand ready to supply or submit such additional matter as the committee may deem proper or necessary, and pledge their continued aid to this essential protective project.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRIS COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT,
By: ERNEST A. KNIPP, *General Attorney.*
HARRIS COUNTY,
By: BOB CASEY, *County Judge.*
HARRIS COUNTY-HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL AND NAVIGATION DISTRICT,
By: W. F. HEAVEY, *General Manager.*
CITY OF HOUSTON,
By: J. M. NAGLE, *Director, Department of Public Works.*
HOUSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By: W. B. BATES, *President.*

(The address of all of the parties is: Houston, Harris County, Tex.)

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., Saturday, July 28, 1951, the hearing was recessed until 10:30 a. m., Monday, July 30, 1951.)